13 AM 9: 56	UNITED STAT		ELAWARE
Omega Consulting, as Ass	signee of	§	CASE NO
Ramesh H. Bhat		§	
Plaintiff		§	
		§	VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR
-V-		§	DAMAGES, BREACH OF
		§	FIDUCIARY DUTY,
Firstmark Corporation		8	BREACH OF CONTRACT, GROSS
Defendants		§	MISMANAGEMENT, WASTE
		/	

COMES NOW, Omega Consulting, Plaintiff and Assignee of RAMESH H. BHAT, and files this lawsuit against Defendants, Capitol Securities, Inc & Firstmark Corporation, jointly and individually, for damages for breach of breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, gross mismanagement, and waste as those terms are understood in law.

PARTIES

- 1. Omega Consulting, (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is the Assignee of RAMESH H. BHAT, and Plaintiff is a sole proprietorship organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas and has a principal place of business at 7706 Pinebrook Drive; San Antonio, Texas 78230.
- 2. Defendant Firstmark Corporation is a Delaware corporation whose last known business address is in Ohio at 200 W. Washington St; Indianapolis, IN 46204.

SERVICE

3. Pursuant to 8 Del.C. § 321, process may be effectuated upon Firstmark Corporation by delivering duplicate copies of the papers to be served to the Secretary of State, along with fifty dollars (\$50), and a declaration that service is being effectuated under said statute.

JURISDICTION

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C. 1332, as the plaintiff's state of citizenship, Texas, is diverse from those of the defendant, Delaware.
- 5. Venue is proper here pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391 because the defendant is incorporated in the District.
- 6. Additionally, the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional amount of this Court, for which damages, Plaintiff now sues.

BACKGROUND FACTS

- 7. On March 1, 1990, Defendant, Firstmark Corporation's corporate charter was canceled by the Division of Corporations for the State of Delaware. On July 29, 1992, the corporation's charter and/or certificate of authority to conduct business in Indiana was revoked by the Indiana Secretary of State.
- 8. On August 26, 1988, said Defendant filed a Chapter 11 bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Indiana. That bankruptcy case closed on January 17, 1996. The corporation did not receive a discharge of its debts. Since January 18, 1996, said defendant has not wound up its incidental affairs under the state of Indiana's corporation statutes, nor under Delaware corporation statutes.
- 9. On or before June 27, 2008, Assignor, RAMESH H. BHAT discovered that defendant, Firstmark Corporation continued to own valuable choses in action or rights to recover unclaimed corporate assets totaling \$95,000 or more which are being held in the unclaimed property registry for the bankruptcy court for the Southern District of Indiana, and which assets reasonably

could have been utilized to satisfy an outstanding obligation to said Assignor totaling One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000), which represents original unpaid principle from cash investments and/or equity disbursements made by Assignor to said Defendant.

- 10. Plaintiff declares under penalty of perjury that said corporation is indebted to plaintiff in the minimum amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00), and this debt and/or claim has not been paid.
- 11. Since January 17, 1997, Defendant Firstmark Corporation has abandoned all responsibility and obligation to wind up the defendant's affairs. Nevertheless, the defendant has continued to exist as a dissolved corporation with an express responsibility to wind up such incidental affairs as provided in Indiana and Delaware corporation statutes. Corporate obligations have maintained their viability, and the Defendant continues to owe duty and obligations to the creditors like Plaintiff.
- 12. Plaintiff shows that based on fundamental concepts of equity and general dissolution practice, the assets of a dissolved corporation belong to its creditors and such assets continue to be subject to claims that have not been addressed during the required winding up activity.
- 13. Upon information and believe, Plaintiff believes that the Defendant Firstmark Corporation is the legal owner of cash assets, and holder of a choses in action or claim in the amount of Ninety-Five Thousand Dollars Nine Hundred Sixty-Four Dollars & Seventeen Cents (\$95,964.17).
- 14. Plaintiff would show that since the property described above reachable as a matter of equity and/or law by Defendant Firstmark Corporation, and therefore said choses in action is reachable and recoverable by Plaintiff and Assignee as the holder of claims, rights, and/or privileges

against said defendant as a victim of breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, gross mismanagement, fraud, negligent, etc.

- 15. Plaintiff would show that as a direct result of Defendant Firstmark Corporation's breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, fraud, overreaching, gross misfeasance, nonfeasance, negligence, and/or gross mismanagement, said defendant has failed to recover and utilize the unclaimed property assets described above for payment of obligations owed to Plaintiff.
- 16. Plaintiff would show that damages have been sustained as a result of Defendants action and/or inaction.
- 17. Assignor discovered in February that the Defendant Firstmark Corporation had failed to wind up its affairs by recovering, reclaiming, and maximizing the benefit of certain choses in action, tangible property or unclaimed assets. The Assignor has assigned his rights, interests, and privileges to Omega Consulting.
- 18. Neither Indiana, nor Delaware corporation statutes show any effort by Defendant Firstmark Corporation to embrace the winding up provisions of the corporation statutes by sending the notices to known creditors as contemplated under the provisions of such statutes.

FIRST CAUSES OF ACTION (For Breach of Fiduciary Duty & Breach of Contract)

- 19. Defendant Firstmark Corporation had an express and unavoidable duty and obligation to gather any remaining assets and pay any remaining debts, including the damages described herein.
- 20. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

- 21. Defendant Firstmark Corporation owed to Plaintiff a fiduciary duty to exercise due care in their oversight of the affairs of the company. The defendant's duty of care included, among other things:
 - the duty to remain adequately informed of the company's affairs, policies, practices, a. and procedures;
 - b. the duty to establish and maintain adequate internal controls to ensure that the company engaged in dissolution procedures in a prudent, reasonable and lawful manner;
 - the duty to supervise management and make sure that management carried out the c. company's policies, practices, and procedures;
 - d. the duty to act in the best interests of the company and/or its creditors;
 - the duty to ensure that management acted in the best interests of the Company and/or e. its creditors;
 - f. the duty to make informed decisions regarding the company's use and preservation of its assets;
 - the duty to prevent waste of the company's assets; g.
 - h. the duty to properly address and ensure resolution of significant issues that could adversely impact upon the equitable interests in the company's assets; and,
 - i. the duty to properly oversee and guide the company in its financial and corporate affairs.

- 22. In discharging these duties, Defendant Firstmark Corporation was required to exercise reasonable care.
- 23. Defendant Firstmark Corporation has willfully, recklessly, grossly and negligently breached its fiduciary duty of care to creditors, including the Assignor, among other things:
 - a. failing to remain adequately informed regarding the gathering of assets and discharge of corporate liabilities;
 - b. failing to implement appropriate measures to insure that compliance with Texas' statutory and common law obligations to discharge the company's liabilities from the available assets;
 - failing implement appropriate measures to prevent the blatant failure of the company
 to pursue an acceptable dissolution process, leading to a deterioration and waste of
 corporate assets;
 - d. failing to prevent company management from violating applicable federal and state laws, rules, and regulations, or the company's policies, practices, and procedures;
 - e. failing to challenge inappropriate or potentially illegal conduct of management;
 - f. failing to act in the best interests of the company and failing to ensure that management acted in the best interests of the company;
 - g. failing to properly supervise company management in implementing appropriate and acceptable dissolution procedures;
 - h. failing to make informed decisions regarding the company's use and preservation of its assets;

gather the assets of the corporation and to discharge the liability owed to such Plaintiff The company has breached this duty.

25. Plaintiff would show that the actions of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation are the result of willful mismanagement, gross negligence, and/or reckless disregard towards duties owed to creditors, including those such as Plaintiffs. Said company has intentionally, knowingly, and with conscious indifference failed to fulfill duties owed to creditors, including those like Plaintiff. With conscious indifference and/or intentional disregard and/or grossly negligent conduct, said company has allowed the assets of the corporation to be wasted and/or failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that the corporation's assets are utilized to discharge the liabilities owed to creditors, including those like Plaintiff.

ACTUAL DAMAGES

26. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of his fiduciary duties, as described in the previous paragraphs, Plaintiff has sustained damages that exceed this Court's minimum jurisdictional amounts. Those damages total at least One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000), which represents the original unpaid principle amount of cash investments and/or equity

VERIFIED COMPLAINT - Pg. 7

- exhibiting a conscious disregard and/or a reckless failure to address the known claims
 and liabilities of the company;
- j. failing to prevent waste of the company's assets
- 24. It is well settled under Indiana and/or Delaware law that a insolvent corporation, like Defendant Firstmark Corporation, owes a duty to its creditors, including those such as Assignor, to

disbursements made by Assignor to Defendant and/or Defendant's Parent Company), plus applicable interest for which damages, Plaintiff now sues.

SECOND CAUSES OF ACTION (For Gross Mismanagement)

- 27. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above in ¶s 1-19 as if fully set forth herein.
- 28. Defendant Firstmark Corporation had a fiduciary duty to properly supervise, direct and control the operations of said company and the activities of its management to ensure that said company was operated in a prudent, reasonable and lawful manner.
- 29. Additionally, and without limiting the previous causes of action, during the relevant time period when the Defendant Firstmark Corporation was required to properly manage the affairs of said defendant company, Defendant Firstmark Corporation either (i) failed to properly supervise management, (ii) knew or recklessly disregarded the unreasonable conduct of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation's management, and/or (iii) either approved such activities or, in bad faith, failed to take appropriate remedial measures to prevent or resolve them.
- 30. As a direct and proximate result of the gross mismanagement of the affairs of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation, creditors like Assignor and its Assignee, have suffered damages, which, in this instance, total One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,00).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (For Waste Against Defendant and Does)

31. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above in ¶s 1-16 as if fully set forth herein.

- Additionally, and without limiting the previous causes of action, Defendant Firstmark 32. Corporation had a fiduciary duty to creditors, like the Assignors and its Assignee, to properly supervise, direct and control the operations of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation and the activities of management subsequent to its administrative dissolution to prevent any waste of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation' assets.
- 33. During the relevant time period when the Defendant Firstmark Corporation was required to prevent waste of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation' assets, the Defendants either:
 - (i) failed to properly supervise management,
 - (ii) knew or recklessly disregarded the unreasonable conduct of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation' management as described herein, and/or
 - (iii) either approved such activities, or, in bad faith, failed to take appropriate remedial measures to prevent or resolve them.
- 34. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant Firstmark Corporation's gross mismanagement of the affairs of Defendant Firstmark Corporation, creditors like Assignor and its Assignee, suffered the damages as previously alleged herein.
- 35. By reason of the foregoing, Assignor suffered damages which rights thereto have been Assigned to Omega Consulting. Such Assignee will continue to suffer such damages unless relief is granted. Those damages total One Hundred Thousand Dollars (100,000).

REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JUDGE

36. Plaintiff requests that this matter be tried before Judge, and reserves the right to request a jury trial.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Eric B. Dangerfield d/b/a Omega Consulting, as Assignee of Ramesh H. Bhat prays that this Court enter appropriate orders as requested herein pursuant to law and equity for actual damages in the Total Amount of One Hundred Thousand (\$100,000), plus attorney fees and costs.

OMEGA CONSULTING, as Assignee of

RAMESH H. BHAT

BY:

Eric Dangerfield, Pro

7706 Pinebrook Dr

San Antonio, Texas 78230

Tel-(210) 430-0649

Fax-(206) 888-4687

Email: omega77x7@yahoo.com

NOTARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT

BEFORE ME, in the County of **BEXAR**, in the State of **TEXAS**, personally appeared **ERIC DANGERFIELD**, who provided valid identification and executed this instrument.

5/12/08 DATE:

NÓTARY PÚBLIĆ

MY Commission Expires:

MORDECHAI B. HELBON MY COMMISSION EXPIRES June 28, 2011

Document 1-2 Filed 08/13/2008 Page 1 of 1 0 8 - 5 0 9

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I (a) DI AINTIEEC			DEFENDANTS		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
Omega Consulting, as A	Assignee of Ramesh H. Bhat	Firstmark Corporation			
	of First Listed Plaintiff BEXAR (TX) XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE. IN LANG		New Castle (DE) s ONLY) use the location of the
		1	LAND I	NVOLVED.	
	, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)		
0	mega Consulting; 7706 Pinebrook D				
	Te-(210) 430-0649; Fax-(206) 888-46		EIZENCIUD OF D	DINCIPAL BARTIN	<u> </u>
ii. Basis of Jurisu	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		For Diversity Cases Only)	KINCIPAL PARTIE	S(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 		PT	TF DEF 1	PTF DEF Principal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	▼ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizer	n of Another State	2	Principal Place
	,		n or Subject of a gign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS		RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits ⋈ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 340 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 341 Voting □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer w/Disabilities - Other □ 310 Airplane Product Liability □ 370 Other Fraud □ 370 Other Fraud □ 370 Other Fraud □ 380 Other Personal □ Property Damag □ Product Liability □ 385 Property Damag □ Product Liability □ 510 Motions to Vac. Sentence □ Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & O □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condutio	y-fice	Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Il iquor Laws R R & Truck Airline Regs Occupational Safety/Health Other LABOR D Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act Railway Labor Act Other Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 ■ PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark ■ SOCIAL SECURITY ■ □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) ▼ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 20 USC 7609	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Re	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you	Reope	ened anothe		on Judgment
	ARCOCK a Content, was	te 28	USC 1391,	28 45C 1332	Damages Deg 100/16
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:			CMAND \$	CHECK YES onl JURY DEMANI	y'if demanded in complaint: D:
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	ATTORNEY O	OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
	MOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	МАС. Л	JDGE
	70721110111				

$\Omega_{ ext{mega}}$

7706 Pinebrook Drive • San Antonio, Tx 78230 • Phone-(210) 430-0649 • Fax-(206) 888-4687 • omega77x7@yahoo.com

August 12, 2008

Via Overnight Mail

U.S. District Court for Delaware

ATTN: CLERK OF COURT / FILING DEPARTMENT

J. Caleb Boggs Federal Bldg

844 North King Street

Wilmington, DE 19801-3519

Re:

Omega Consulting vs. Firstmark Corporation

Case No:

TBA

Dear Sirs\Madams:

Please find enclosed an original verified complaint, along with four (4) summons to be issued by the clerk's office, along with a money order in the amount of \$350 to cover filing fees. A pre-paid United Postal Service overnight mail envelope is enclosed for returning the file-stamped complaint, and clerk-stamped summons to the undersigned.

Thank you for your prompt attention.

Respectfully yours

Eric Dangerfield, Pro Se

5008 AUG 13 AM 9:53

· Walte to folkich

Bl

と リ 9

Reca 153035

OFFICE OF THE CLERK UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

2008 AUG 18 AM 9: 22 Peter T. Dalleo CLERK

wp\forms\rule4receipt 2-04

LOCKBOX 18 844 KING STREET U.S. COURTHOUSE WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19801 (302) 573-6170

RE: C.A.#	
CASE CAPTION:	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF	F RECEIPT FOR F.R.Civ.P. 4
, ,	t of a copy of Rule 4 (Summons) of the Federal that it is my responsibility to make service of his rule.
Date Received Xûy and 15, 2008 by Plaintiff:	Signed. Pro Se Plaintiff
Date Receivedby Clerk's office:	Signed: Deputy Clerk
Note: If you received Federal Rule 4 by m	ail, please sign this receipt and return it to:
Clerk U.S. District Court 844 N. King Street Lockbox 18 Wilmington, DE 19801	If applicable, Rule 4 mailed to plaintiff: 3/13/08 Date mailed By Deputy Clerk
cc: Docketing Clerk	

BL		
pistal chollan		
2008 AUG 18 AM 9: 22		
AO FORM 85 RECEIPT (REV. 9/04)	
Ur	nited States District Court for the District of Delaware	
	r'	0 9
	Civil Action No.	

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT FOR AO FORM 85

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION
I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF COPIES OF AO FORM 85. Solve
(Printed name of Party or their Representative)
Note: Completed receipt will be filed in the Civil Action